

## UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

ph

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/688,903	10/21/2003	Mitsuo Yasushi	040894-5969	3921	
55694 7590 05/15/2007 DRINKER BIDDLE & REATH (DC)		EXAMINER			
1500 K STREE	1500 K STREET, N.W.	•	ADAMS, C	ADAMS, CHARLES D	
SUITE 1100 WASHINGTON, DC 20005-1209			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
			2164		
			NAW DATE		
	•		MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
			05/15/2007	PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

## Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.		Applicant(s)		
10/688,903		YASUSHI ET AL.		
İ	Examiner	Art Unit		
	Charles D. Adams	2164		

	Charles D. Adams	2164					
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the c	correspondence add	ress -				
THE REPLY FILED <u>27 April 2007</u> FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.							
1.  The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on this application, applicant must timely file one of the follow places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a No a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance time periods:	ving replies: (1) an amendment, aff tice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in (	fidavit, or other evider compliance with 37 C	rce, which FR 41.31; or (3)				
The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date of the final rejection.  The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.  Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN							
TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPÉP 7							
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of exunder 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b) NOTICE OF APPEAL	tension and the corresponding amount shortened statutory period for reply orig than three months after the mailing da	of the fee. The approprinally set in the final Offi	iate extension fee ce action; or (2) as				
2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any external Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed AMENDMENTS	nsion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of th	ns of the date of e appeal. Since				
3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection,  (a) They raise new issues that would require further co	nsideration and/or search (see NO		ecause				
<ul> <li>(b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE belo</li> <li>(c) They are not deemed to place the application in bet appeal; and/or</li> </ul>		ducing or simplifying	the issues for				
(d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).	corresponding number of finally rej	ected claims.					
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.1.	21. See attached Notice of Non-Co	ompliant Amendment	(PTOL-324).				
5. $\ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \$	***						
<ol> <li>Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be al non-allowable claim(s).</li> </ol>	·	•					
7.  For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is protected. The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to:		II be entered and an e	explanation of				
Claim(s) rejected: <u>1-8.</u> Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:							
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE							
<ol> <li>The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but because applicant failed to provide a showing of good an- was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).</li> </ol>							
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to of showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessar	overcome <u>all</u> rejections under appe y and was not earlier presented. S	al and/or appellant fa See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(	ils to provide a 1).				
<ol> <li>The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanatio REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER</li> </ol>	n of the status of the claims after e	entry is below or attacl	ned.				
<ol> <li>The request for reconsideration has been considered bu <u>See Continuation Sheet.</u></li> </ol>	t does NOT place the application i	n condition for allowa	nce because:				
12.  Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s).	(PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)	•					
13. A Other: See Continuation Sheet.							

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Applicant argues that the equation found in Jacobi paragraphs [0082]-[0084] does not teach the limitation "dividing the similarities of the pieces of selected music by the played frequencies of the pieces of selected music". As applicant noted, N(common) is the number of customers who bought both item A and item B. This is a degree of similarity. sqrt(N(a) \* N(b)) is a variable which takes into account the total number of purchases of A and total number of purchases of B. This signifies popularity, As popularity can be measured by both the number of times a song is played and the number of times it is purchased, and as Robinson teaches using played frequencies to determine popularity, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have replaced one degree of popularity with another, and to have used played frequencies instead of purchase frequencies. Also see the Final Rejection of 29 January 2007, pages 3-4.

Continuation of 13. Other: Applicant's amendments were simply following the advice of the Examiner in removing a limitation that was redundant because it already existed in a previous claim. Claim 2 contained the limitation "wherein the selected piece of music is a plurality of pieces of music", while a limitation from the Claim 1 was "selecting, on a basis of comparison results, a plruality of pieces of music". As a plurality of pieces of music was already being selected in claim 1, this limitation in claim 2 was redundant. As such, the amendment does not overcome the prior art of record.

CHARLES RONES
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER